

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 10 and 18 are amended, and claims 9 and 11-17 are withdrawn. Reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative, Ms. Jaquelin Spong, at the personal interview conducted July 17, 2003. The substance of the interview is incorporated into the following Remarks, which constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

Regarding the withdrawal of claims 10, 18 and 20 from consideration, the Office Action asserts that "at least one color pigment layer being formed only at a part of an area overlapping the reflective area" is not found in the species of Fig. 32. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The phrase "only at a part" means that the color pigment layer does not cover the whole area overlapping the reflective layer. Indeed, in Fig. 32, the pigment layer non-formation area is designated as areas 711D, 711E, and 711F, which are areas in which the pigment layer is not formed. Claims 10 and 18 have been amended by this Amendment to more clearly recite the claimed feature as illustrated by Fig. 32, by amending "formed only at a part" to instead recite "not being formed at a part". Therefore, the feature recited in claim 20 (by its dependence from claim 10) and similarly recited in claim 18 "of at least one color pigment layer not being formed at a part of an area overlapping the reflective layer" is found in Fig. 32. As discussed during the interview, Applicant respectfully requests rejoinder of the withdrawn claims 10, 18 and 20. The following remarks assume that claims 10, 18 and 20 are rejoined. Thus, claims 1-8, 10 and 18-20 should be under consideration, and claims 9 and 11-17 remain withdrawn.

The Office Action objects to claim 1 for informalities, and rejects claims 2-4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 3 and 8 are

amended to obviate the objection and rejection, as discussed during the interview. Applicant respectfully requests that the above objection and rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Miyashita (U.S. Patent 6,124,909). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Miyashita discloses all the subject matter recited in claim 1. Applicant submits that Miyashita does not disclose "a first dimension of a transmissive area corresponding to the transmissive portion of at least one sub-pixel out of the plurality of sub-pixels and a second dimension of a transmissive area corresponding to the transmissive portion at another sub-pixel, the first dimension and the second dimension differing according to the spectral properties of the illumination light" as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 18.

Miyashita discloses a liquid crystal display device wherein the area of each color filter is set to be smaller than that of each pixel area to form non-colored light-exit areas (See col. 2, lines 35-39). Miyashita further discloses the manipulation of the thicknesses of the color filters of the respective color areas in order to manipulate the spectral properties of the light transmitted through the color filters (see col. 4, lines 8-22). Miyashita does not disclose or suggest a transmissive portion of a transflective layer, in addition to a color filter, wherein a first and a second dimension of the transmissive portion differ "according to the spectral properties of the illumination light," as recited in claims 1 and 18. Miyashita simply does not recognize any subject matter relating to a dimension of a transmissive portion of a transflective layer, in connection with spectral properties of the illumination light. Therefore, Miyashita does not disclose or suggest each and every feature recited in claims 1 and 18.

Claims 2-8, and 19 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Miyashita for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, as well as for the additional features they

recite. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-8 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-8, 10 and 18-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jaquelin K. Spong
Registration No. 52,241

JAO:JKS/ale

Date: August 13, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461